

REMARKS

In the latest Office Action, the Examiner indicated that Claims 9-12 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the stated rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112. By way of this Amendment, Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner in paragraph 8 of the Office Action. Thus, this Section 112 rejection should be moot.

The specification was objected to because it lacked a reference to Figure 7. This Amendment now amends the specification to add a specific reference to Figure 7.

Finally, a new Figure 7 has been presented in the Replacement Drawings. For the Examiner's convenience, a complete new set of Replacement Drawings has been enclosed, even though only Figure 7 contains any changes. The changes to Figure 7 follow the Examiner's suggestions raised in paragraph 3 of the latest Office Action. Accordingly, the objections to the drawings should now be moot.

Entry of this amendment after final is proper.

Since the Examiner has indicated that the claims would be allowable if these amendments were made, it is submitted that entry of this Amendment After Final is in order.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 9, 2009

By: /G. Gregory Schivley/
G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382

HARNES, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/bh

15100310.1